



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

**Correspondence Received**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
LINDSEY P. HORVATH  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
BUDG 1.		Oppose	Marva Y Smith	
		Item Total	1	
BUDG 2.		Oppose	Amy Eriksen	<p>My name is Amy Eriksen, Director at one of the largest art centers in District 4, and I am speaking today as a resident and arts worker to strongly oppose the proposed cuts to the Department of Arts and Culture in the FY 2025–26 Recommended Budget.</p> <p>The County's decision to raise department curtailments from 3% to 8.5% will result in nearly \$2 million in cuts to three critical programs: the Organizational Grant Program (OGP), the Community Impact Arts Grant (CIAG), and the Arts Internship Program (AIP).</p> <p>These programs are so important to our entire community, internships allow the completion of the school to career pipeline for one of the largest economies in LA County, the Creative Economy. If we keep these funds and those that take care of arts in our community, we will keep jobs that also stop families and individuals from having to become homeless. These jobs take care of whole families and the nonprofit employees make up almost 10% of our counties workforce. Please put these dollars back for the arts!</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
LINDSEY P. HORVATH  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
BUDG 2.		<b>Oppose</b>	Crystal Baranyk	<p>My name is Crystal Baranyk, and I am speaking today as a [resident/arts worker/representative of independent fine artists to strongly oppose the proposed cuts to the Department of Arts and Culture in the FY 2025–26 Recommended Budget.</p> <p>The County's decision to cut nearly \$2 million across three critical programs: the Organizational Grant Program (OGP), the Community Impact Arts Grant (CIAG), and the Arts Internship Program (AIP) will be devastating for the arts in our county.</p> <p>We are already facing significant setbacks, recovering from pandemic-era and wildfire losses and grappling with federal and state-level cuts. These programs are the backbone of LA County's cultural infrastructure. They fund small and mid-sized nonprofit arts organizations that provide jobs, education, mental health, youth programming, and community resilience, especially in historically underserved neighborhoods.</p> <p>Let's be clear: a \$2 million cut to county grants may seem modest in a \$47.9 billion budget, but it would erase critical lifelines for dozens of organizations and risk hundreds of creative jobs at a time when the sector is already under immense strain.</p> <p>We appreciate the County's investments in youth programs like Youth@Work, but these are also forward-looking initiatives that must be matched with sustained support for arts organizations that hire and support young people. Please help Los Angeles remain a global creative capital rooted in equity, access, and opportunity for all.</p> <p>Thank You</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
LINDSEY P. HORVATH  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
BUDG 2.		Other	Pearl A Marshall	<p>As a taxpayer and lifelong Angelino, I am appalled by the lack of transparency coming from the Board of Supervisors, their staff, and the Chief Executive Office. The lack of Fiscal Responsibility should warrant an Audit by the Attorney General's office. The County of Los Angeles is self-insured and has coverage under California Joint Powers Insurance Authority (CJPIA). You have indemnity insurance for Unique Insurance Coverage for Sexual Misconduct Liability. That should help with what is owed to the victims of the Probation and Foster Care system that were wards of the County of Los Angeles. The Gross Negligence by all those aware of the allegation's date back decades. Where is the money that the county should have set aside, as they knew, this Probation issue would eventually need to be settled financially. The County of Los Angeles has established specific self-insurance programs and procedures to manage their financial responsibility. They have a whole Department dedicated to this job called Risk Management. Maclaren Hall, the location where most of the sexual assaults allegedly occurred, in in the city of El Monte, would have been required to be covered under CJPIA. This lawsuit didn't just happen, are you telling us that no one foresaw or projected Financial Responsibility? If that is true, then people need to be fired and audit into the taxpayer's money should be performed.</p> <p>Directly from the County of Los Angeles Risk Management webpage:</p> <p>"Risk Transfer is responsible for purchasing insurance Countywide, conducting insurance compliance reviews, and providing indemnification and insurance expertise to all County of Los Angeles (County) Departments.</p> <p>The County strives to obtain commercial insurance for multiple risks that could negatively affect the County. The County is constantly analyzing the risks and benefits by which obtaining insurance provides additional financial stability to the County and its constituents. The purchasing of insurance allows the County better protection when conducting day-to-day activities, as well as allowing the County to better serve its constituents by taking more proactive roles in public safety and health initiatives that may be of a higher risk but of greater public value."</p> <p>Pearl A. Marshall</p>
		Item Total	3	



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS  
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
LINDSEY P. HORVATH  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

**Correspondence Received**

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
BUDG 5.		Other	Pearl A Marshall	<p>As a taxpayer and lifelong Angelino, I am appalled by the lack of transparency coming from the Board of Supervisors, their staff, and the Chief Executive Office. The lack of Fiscal Responsibility should warrant an Audit by the Attorney General's office. The County of Los Angeles is self-insured and has coverage under California Joint Powers Insurance Authority (CJPIA). You have indemnity insurance for Unique Insurance Coverage for Sexual Misconduct Liability. That should help with what is owed to the victims of the Probation and Foster Care system that were wards of the County of Los Angeles. The Gross Negligence by all those aware of the allegation's date back decades. Where is the money that the county should have set aside, as they knew, this Probation issue would eventually need to be settled financially. The County of Los Angeles has established specific self-insurance programs and procedures to manage their financial responsibility. They have a whole Department dedicated to this job called Risk Management. Maclaren Hall, the location where most of the sexual assaults allegedly occurred, in in the city of El Monte, would have been required to be covered under CJPIA. This lawsuit didn't just happen, are you telling us that no one foresaw or projected Financial Responsibility? If that is true, then people need to be fired and audit into the taxpayer's money should be performed.</p> <p>Directly from the County of Los Angeles Risk Management webpage:</p> <p>"Risk Transfer is responsible for purchasing insurance Countywide, conducting insurance compliance reviews, and providing indemnification and insurance expertise to all County of Los Angeles (County) Departments.</p> <p>The County strives to obtain commercial insurance for multiple risks that could negatively affect the County. The County is constantly analyzing the risks and benefits by which obtaining insurance provides additional financial stability to the County and its constituents. The purchasing of insurance allows the County better protection when conducting day-to-day activities, as well as allowing the County to better serve its constituents by taking more proactive roles in public safety and health initiatives that may be of a higher risk but of greater public value."</p> <p>Pearl A. Marshall</p>
			Pearl A Marshall	<p>As a taxpayer and lifelong Angelino, I am appalled by the lack of transparency coming from the Board of Supervisors, their staff, and the Chief Executive Office.</p>



## PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS  
HOLLY J. MITCHELL  
LINDSEY P. HORVATH  
JANICE HAHN  
KATHRYN BARGER

### Correspondence Received

Secondly, let's address the misinformation given to the Taxpayers of Los Angeles County and the media.

- All of you on Management Appraisal and performance Plan (MAPP) get guaranteed annual raises based on performance. This is a guaranteed 1-5% annual raise. Yet you say there is no money except for the elitist group.
- Yet you make the Union represented or not represented employees beg for raises.

Directly from the County of Los Angeles Muni-Code

- 6.08.375 - Tier I Merit Salary Adjustment Provisions.

A. Annually, in accordance with guidelines issued by the Chief Executive Officer, each Participant's Appointing Authority shall recommend a Merit Salary Adjustment, ranging from a minimum of zero percent to a maximum of five percent. Such Merit Salary Adjustments shall be limited to Participants who have been in MAPP prior to April 1st of the current fiscal year and whose current performance rating is "Met Expectations" or higher and shall take effect on October 1st of each year except as otherwise provided by this Plan. Merit Salary Adjustment recommendations are subject to Chief Executive Officer prior to becoming effective. Such adjustments may apply to and/or result in a salary that falls outside the established Tier I Salary range.

B. Appointed Department Head Merit Salary Adjustments. Chief Executive Officer shall assess the performance of appointed department heads in consultation with the Board of Supervisors. Following such consultation, the Chief Executive Officer may authorize Tier I Merit Salary Adjustments for appointed department heads who have a current performance evaluation of "Met Expectations" or better at such times as designated by the Chief Executive Officer. Such adjustments may apply to and/or result in a salary that falls outside the established Tier I Salary range.

(Ord. 2018-0047 § 19, 2018; Ord. 2008-0069 § 9, 2008; Ord. 2007-0049 § 20, 2007.)

- Stop telling everyone that there is no money to pay livable wages and increase the lower paid county employees by paying livable wages. We have county employees that qualify for the same services they provide to low-income families. Your own county employees are not making it or barely making it. Shame on you. Cut the fat from the top and stop trying to pay the employee with a one-time payoff that is not pensionable. Without them the county would come to a halt.

- 8.100.020 - Findings.

The Board of Supervisors finds that, as of 2015, twenty seven percent (27%) of the overall population of the County of Los Angeles is living in poverty, which is defined by the California Poverty Measure as an annual household income of less than \$30,785 for a family of four. Many impoverished residents, despite working full-time, earn too little to cover bare necessities such as safe housing, healthy food, adequate clothing, and basic medical care. With each year, the cost of living in the County rises while real wages for the lowest income County residents stagnate or fail to keep pace.

You allow the county buildings that you oversee to become run down. You are basically slum lords making your county workforce work in squalor

				<p>conditions. Go to your county buildings and see the conditions you make the employees work in. Broken air conditioning, broken heating system, leaky roofs, broken or leaky pipes, mold, mildew, broken-down workstations, filthy carpets, broken tiles, broken computer servers, broken chairs, broken monitors, and lack of custodial services, just to name a few. The county infrastructure is truly in poor condition for being one of the largest counties that is financially backed by the taxpayers. Maybe DOGE needs to come in to get rid of the waste and fraud. If you are not here to serve the people and the employees maybe it is time you left. We need leaders that are not sheep and who know what is means to be Fiscally responsible, to be able to project the needs of not just the county but it's workforce, the infrastructure, and a proper Risk Management Department. This is why your executives, and the CEO get paid the big bucks.</p> <p>Stop making the county workforce work in squalor conditions, fix the broken infrastructure and give the workers a fair raise. Cut the Fat! All the MAPP and Executives can afford to give up their raises for the next 6 years and it won't alter their lives. But it would be for the regular workforce</p> <p>Pearl A. Marshall</p>
		<b>Item Total</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>6</b>	